



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,205	04/20/2001	Srikanth Natarajan	10007592/021	9389

7590 03/08/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HOSSAIN, TANIM M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2145

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/838,205

Applicant(s)

NATARAJAN ET AL.

Examiner

Tanim Hossain

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/20/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lecheler et al (U.S. 6,425,008).

As per claim 1, Lecheler teaches a method for identifying the source of an event in a computer network, comprising the steps of: associating an identifier tag with an event occurring within the computer network, wherein the identifier tag uniquely identifies at least one collection computer monitoring the event based on a domain name (column 2, lines 47-54; column 4, lines 30-40; figure 4, step 116, 118); receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one collection computer that includes the identifier tag (column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 5; figure 4, step 120); deriving, by the at least one management computer, an identification of the at least one collection computer from the identifier tag based on the domain name (column 4, lines 47-57; column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 5; column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 5); and identifying to a user the source of the event using the identification of the at least one collection computer, the at least one collection computer being at least one of a collection of

a collection computer and a group of collection computers (column 5, lines 7-9, 63-66; column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 5; figure 5).

As per claim 2, Lecheler teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the identifier tag is a name of the at least one collection computer (column 4, lines 49-52).

As per claim 3, Lecheler teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of deriving comprises the step of: maintaining within the at least one management computer a database of identification information associated with identifier tags (figure 3; column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 4).

As per claim 6, Lecheler teaches the method of claim 1, comprising the steps of: managing, by the collection computer, at least one network object (figure 1; column 3, lines 57-60; column 4, lines 19-21); and resolving, by the collection computer, a network address of each network object into a resolved network address included in the information received at the at least one management computer (column 4, lines 47-49; column 5, lines 5-8).

As per claim 7, Lecheler teaches a system for identifying the source of an event in a computer network, comprising: a plurality of collection computers, wherein an identifier tag uniquely identifies each collection computer or group of collection computers based on a domain name, and wherein the identifier tag is associated with an event occurring within the computer network (figure 1; column 2, lines 52-54; column 4, lines 28-34; figure 4, steps 116, 118; figure 5); at least one management computer for receiving information from the plurality of collection computers that includes the identifier tag, wherein each management computer derives an identification of each collection computer or group of collection computers from the identifier tag based on the domain name (figures 1, 4a, and 4b; column 4, lines 47-57; column 4, line 66 –

column 5, line 5); and means for identifying to a user the source of the event using the identification of each collection computer or group of collection computers (column 5, lines 7-9, 63-66; figure 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lecheler.

As per claim 4, Lecheler teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of identifying comprises the step of: displaying to the user the identification of the at least one collection computer (column 4, lines 32-34). Lecheler does discuss the display of a network address of a network element that generated an event, but chooses not use it in the invention. Instead, Lecheler teaches the display of a resolved network address of a network element that generated an event, as it would be more convenient to convert these network addresses into unique domain identifiers for efficient identification (column 6, lines 13-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include displaying the network address of a network element that generated an event, as it is a different option of displaying the required information.

As per claim 5, Lecheler teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of identifying comprises the step of: mapping each collection computer to a group of collection computers using the identifier tag (column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 1). Lecheler does discuss the

identification to the user the source of the event using the group of collection computers (column 6, lines 5-12). Using the network address of a network element that generated the event, to identify the source of the event to the user, would have been obvious by the same argument as claim 4.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 20, 2005 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

a. Applicant asserts that the Lecheler patent does not teach the derivation of an identification of at least one collection computer at a management computer, with the collection computer being one or a plurality of computers. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Lecheler patent discloses a system of computers, including a managed network, comprising a group of local nodes. These local nodes correspond to a level one manager. Through a customer network interface, an error notice is received. Depending on where the error takes place, a domain name is determined. Based on this domain name and its corresponding level one manager, a unique location identifier is created. An error message is sent to a level two manager using the unique location identifier. The level two manager can then identify exactly where the error took place by tracing back to the level one manager and then the specific domain (column 4, lines 41-65). This constitutes the identifying to a user the source of an event using the identification of the at least one collection computer (level one manager). The level one and two managers may be computer workstations used by a user (column 4, lines 15-40). This also

constitutes the derivation of an identification of at least one collection computer (level 1 manager) at a management computer (level 2 manager).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 571/272-3881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tanim Hossain
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145


JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER